

Review of: "Muddle and Method: The Post-Resurrection Appearances of Jesus in Focus"

Mark Goodacre¹

¹ Duke University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting and well-written exploration of Michael Goulder's scholarship about the origin of the resurrection stories, focusing specifically on the question of the "vision" or "hallucination" hypothesis. The author contrasts Goulder's work with Michael Licona's analysis of it, and though he finds some difficulties in Goulder's work, he also finds Licona's wanting.

The author has looked at a good range of literature, though the analysis would be improved by consideration of Dale Allison's work, which considers the hallucination / vision hypothesis sympathetically, critically, and in some detail.

The author is generally fair-minded, but he is somewhat disparaging at points to Licona, e.g., saying that he is "a slave to his presuppositions," and referring frequently, and negatively, to his evangelical Christian faith. Some of these comments come across as ad hominem. He is more sympathetic overall to Goulder, though it is unfair to speak of his "reputation as a maverick among scholars" and his lack of "sound method." It is true that Goulder has always had his critics, but there is no question about his genius and the qualities of his exegesis. Thus, the statement that "No doubt exegetical precision is well within his grasp, but that is the part he chooses to conceal from the public gaze" is unfair. The author does not refer to Michael Goulder's *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth* (2001), in which Goulder develops some of the theses discussed in his popular-level 1994 book. The dates of *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* and *The Evangelists' Calendar* are the wrong way round (but correct in the bibliography). N. T. Wright's first name is not "Neil" (bibliography).